DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)
DATE: FEB 2, 2004
TIME: 10:00 A.M. TO 11:45 A.M.
LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM 6D

WEAT Members In Attendance:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Ben Banks (a DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – George Ross (a DET representative)
- Solution Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, a representative of small state agency)
- Solution Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., a local government representative)
- Solution Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, a representative of large state agency)

WEAT Members Absent:

- Solution Architect – Keith Hazelton (a UW representative)

DET Support Staff: Patricia Carlson, Michelle Eldridge

Meeting Handouts:

(1) WEAT Principles and Review of AZ GITA web site, Email Message, Author: Jay Jeager – see page 7

(2) Issues Facing WEAT, Email Message, Author: Jay Jeager Some Principles of Architecture, Email Message Author: Jay Jeager – see page 8

(3) Statement of Direction for Strategic IT Planning Letter to Department Secretaries, Authors:Matt Miszewski and David Schmiedicke – see page 9

Agenda Items:

(1) Discussion of each member's (and their interaction with represented agencies) review of AZ and Federal EA Models

(2) Discussion of WEAT Guiding Principles

Discussion of each member's (and their interaction with represented agencies) review of AZ and Federal EA Models

Jay Jeager emailed his comments and those of represented agencies to WEAT members, see page 7 for a copy of the email message.

Ben commented that he saw some "pitfalls" within the GITA EA model. He stated that he had spoken with GITA staff and from their perspective, Wisconsin was in a 'better' position, as we have an IT governance structure in place to assist in developing, fostering the collaboration need to develop and implement an EA. Ben hopes that the GITA and Federal models can assist WEAT, but that WEAT will develop an EA to address needs of Wisconsin.

Jay stated that in general there was a lot of useful information posted on the GITA enterprise architecture web site (http://www.gita.state.az.us/enterprise_architecture/). Specifically, that the uniform approach, consistency of their model is something that WEAT should emulate. Jay had positive feedback from DNR regarding the GITA model. DNR commented that the model provided clear lines of authority and responsibility.

Jay relayed to WEAT. concerns that DOT's (Department of Transportation) Information Resource and Management (IRM) team had with respect to the GITA approach. Specifically that a "Data and Information Resource Reference Model" was absent or not addressed within the documents posted on the GITA web site. Jay specifically cited the following example to illustrate the concerns of DOT's IRM team, specifically that the following relationship or process flow exists regarding application development:

Business Needs ➔ Architecture ➔ Application

Therefore, there needs to be some guidance provided by the Enterprise Architecture with respect to "data" and "information", as these are the foundations for the majority of application development within the State.

Jay and Bud offered comments with respect to data / information:

- Some data is of enterprise interest.
- Identifying the data of enterprise interest is an important task, as this is the "stuff" that Agencies would like to 'exchange' and 'share'.
- When enterprise 'data' is identified, it will be important to know if this data will be used "horizontally" (among agencies with different business needs, e.g. citizen contact information) or "vertically" (among agencies with similar business needs, e.g. public safety)
- It will be important to identify "data inputs" and "owners" of data inputs to ensure the integrity of 'shared data'.
- There should be a concerted effort to identify data services, architecture, access, meta-data requirements and business alignment with these services/ topics.
- Identifying processes, technologies and standards for "data exchange" will be critical to have a lasting impact or value to the enterprise architecture – as this is what drives the

business of government. For example, a data exchange or integration standard of XML (extensible mark-up language) could be established for all data that has to exchanged among various business/ program areas.

- The development of an enterprise, information repository is a multi-year effort. However, it is important to begin thinking about how this will be achieved and aligned within business/program areas.

- There was a question regarding the viability of the Information Domain. The Domain Manager position has been filled. Lisa Jorgenson will be the Information Domain Manager and Oskar Anderson (DOR's CIO) is the Domain Co-Chair.

- The federal government has not yet produced their Data and Information Reference Model. The Federal CEA, Robert Haycock has said the delay in developing the model is due to the complexity of the task. But the goals of the federal initiative are:

  The Data and Information Reference Model (DRM) will describe, at an aggregate level, the data and information that support program and business line operations. The model will aid in describing the types of interaction and exchanges that occur between the Federal Government and its various customers, constituencies, and business partners. The DRM will categorize the government's information along general content areas and decomposes those content areas into greater levels of detail. The DRM establishes a commonly understood classification for Federal data and leads to the identification of duplicative data resources. A common data model will streamline the processes associated with information exchange both within the Federal government between the government and its external stakeholders.

Discussion of Deliverables for the 90-day Time Frame and Discussion of Current Strategic Planning Efforts

Judy asked what the specific "charge", "deliverables", "goals" are for WEAT within the 90 day time frame.

Ben still needs to confirm with Matt, what is expected for the 90-day deliverables. His current thinking is that within the 90-day time frame, WEAT will accomplish the following items:

- Vision for Enterprise Architecture

- Guiding Principles of the Enterprise Architecture

- Development of "processes: to support implementation of the EA. The proposed processes will focus upon those outlined the EA conceptual diagram version 1.0:
  - Phase 1 Conceptual Architecture Development;
  - Phase 2 Enterprise Standards Established;
  - Phase 3 Design and Build;
  - Phase 4 Implementation; and
  - Phase 5 Maintenance and Sustainability.

- Establishing a mechanism to determine the "business drivers" for the EA.

Jay expressed concerns regarding IT strategic planning efforts and how these integrate within DOT's business plans. He stated that DOT had completed their plans, but is in the process of re-working their plan in light of the Server Consolidation initiative.

Judy also expressed concerns regarding the development of a strategic business plan at DATCP and how this would be integrated within the EA.

Ben addressed the concerns of Jay and Judy by stating that the 90-day effort is a short term deliverable. That within the 90-days, WEAT will begin the process of aligning technology acquisitions within the enterprise. The initial goals are to minimize divergence within current IT budgets and planning cycles.

Ben refers to this effort as "corralling the horses". Specifically, that WEAT / DOA-DET needs to work with the Agencies, the IT Governance Structure and the IT Management Domain to identify the IT efforts / plans/ spending/ inventory/ expertise within Agencies.

Judy requested that WEAT work upon developing a charter to outline the goals (short, long) for WEAT.

Defining the "Principles" for the EA

WEAT members felt Jay's list of guiding principles was a good place to start. WEAT members had several questions with respect to the scope and intent of the EA. These questions are included in the assignments on page 6. After much discussion, generally WEAT members agree that the guiding principles for the EA should include:

- Flexibility
- Recognition of "pervasive" technologies
- Integration
- Interoperability
- Minimizing impact upon partners[1]
- Adaptability
- Promote technology reuse
- Promote "technology equalization"

An assignment for next week is for each member WEAT to bring their ideas regarding "principles".

Note: there was some concern regarding the use of the term "open" with respect to its use as a guiding principle, as there are different interpretations of the word with respect to technology. For example, some individuals interpret "open" as non-Microsoft, while others view "open" as a transport mechanism such as XML.

Organizational Architecture

During the discussion of the "EA Principles", various individuals commented that a "context" should be provided for the "EA Principles". For example, the approach to developing an EA

[1] Michelle Eldridge provided feedback to WEAT regarding the current Technology Leadership Council (TLC) Protocol regarding standards development. Specifically, Michelle stated that the protocol calls for accessing the impact, both in terms of fiscal and business processing. A copy of the governance protocol can be found at:
http://enterprise.state.wi.us/home/tlc/TLCgovprot20031205.pdf

within a small business, a fortune 500 business or federal agency would be different as the "business" of each of these entities is quite different. The context of State Government is that:

- Policy, Legislation and Regulation drive many business practices and needs – and often these changes do not include funding to implement the modifications to business practices.

- Societal changes or situations (e.g. 9-11, Obesity, Mad-Cow Disease, CWD) often require prompt action – again many of these new programs do not have funding attached.

- Not all Agencies are funded at the same level – therefore there should be some mechanism to promote "equality".

- Often in trying to implement a "delta business need", the over-arching business principle is ignored.

Discussion of "Score Cards", Portfolio Management and the IT Management Domain

There was a discussion of WEAT members that "portfolio management" would be one way in which to institutionalize "scoring" and "performance metrics" both within WEAT and at the agency level. There were many views expressed with respect to the development of score cards and portfolio management:

- Development of clear, concise criteria for scoring will be essential to the success of EA and the credibility of WEAT.

- Ideally, EA will allow the State to make its "technology portfolio" available to both Federal and Local Units of Government.

- Prioritization with respect to the "enterprise portfolio" is need – Is there a mechanism for this now? Is the TLC, IT Management Domain the appropriate vehicle?

- Balance between 'formal' and 'informal' processes will be difficult to implement.

- New reporting relationships among technology organizations (e.g. TLC, Domains, ITDC, Agency IT) will be required to perform portfolio management at an enterprise level.

- Business input, representation will be required to develop "criteria" for score cards.

- Needs to be a mechanism to capture "good ideas".

Agency Perspectives – DET needs to become a "Service Organization"

Final comments expressed by WEAT members were that DET will need to transform into more of a "service organization" to support initiatives such as EA. The best way to promulgate the adoption of standards within Agencies is to provide technical consulting and some sort of independent funding resource. The idea of "centers of excellence" was cited as a mechanism to include, incorporate grass-roots support for EA at the Agency level. There also needs to be some thought of how IT resources can be 'shared' among agencies, as many Agencies are experiencing deep cuts with respect to IT.

Assignments for Next Week's Meeting 2-10-2004

Chief Enterprise Architect and Enterprise Architect

- Prepare a list of deliverables due at the end of 90 days.
- Questions to forward to Matt:
  - What is Matt's expectation regarding the standards developed by WEAT, are these 'mandatory' or are they 'guidance"?
  - Is the focus of WEAT to address both the standards needs of State Agencies and Local Units of Government?
  - There is the perception among some members of WEAT, that there has been a change from a de-centralized model to a centralized model for IT. Is this perception correct?

WEAT members

- Prepare a list of guiding principles for developing the enterprise architecture.

WEAT Support Staff

- Prepare a draft charter for WEAT to react to and further develop for their use.
- Prepare a document identifying the operational context of State government and organizational architecture issues provided by Jay Jaeger.
- Prepare an agenda for 2-10-2004 meeting.
- Extend the WEAT meeting to 2 hours and secure a meeting room.
- Email WEAT members a copy of the strategic planning letter sent to agencies from DOA.

WEAT Assigments: Architecture principles, Review of Arizona GITA site

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, Jay
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2004 3:17 PM
To: State WEAT Support Team
Subject: WEAT Assigments: architecture principles, review of Arizona GITA site

By way of our "homework", here are some discussion points on principles of architecture and some comments regarding the Arizona GITA enterprise architecture information. (I will also be sharing this material internally and with the other large agencies).

Some Principles of architecture

> Here is a stab at some principles (and areas of principles) for architecture. Most of us use these, informally, to make day to day evaluations and decisions. Most of them are "motherhood and apple pie" kinds of things. The trick will be in weighting these kinds of things.

- Flexibility (Arizona uses the term Adaptability)
  - Standards based (terms like open standards, pervasive standards and industry standards are used).
  - Portable
  - Adaptable to change, legislative initiatives, executive decisions (FYI, this was a (perhaps the primary) business requirement for DOT's DBMS, File Handler, which is still running nearly 30 years later. It has been "going away in 5 years" for the last 15 years. 8^))
  - Avoid falling into a technological backwater: avoid obsolescent technologies, vendor "lock in".
- Alignment with "business needs"
  - Concern over lack of definition and priorities that we can actually use as a measuring stick.
  - Service oriented approach: drive technology and architecture by requirements
  - Citizen service and satisfaction (and avoiding frustration) => current eGovernment trend.
  - Avoiding bureaucracy that gets in the way of good business
  - Creating business opportunities within the confines of good government practice
  - Requirements => Applications => Infrastructure (UW)
  - Sharing data (as appropriate) to avoid redundancies and inconsistencies
  - Services in support of agency missions
  - Accessibility in the face of different abilities, language skills (DWD)
  - Seek new technologies / technological trends as an opportunity to improve based on other principles, not as ends in themselves
  - System availability and reliability
- An investment approach (one could say this is alignment with business needs, but I view it as a cornerstone in its own right)

    - Understanding and planning for all parts of IT system lifecycle and associated costs for all parties: design, development, deployment, support, usage, accurate assessment of lifetime timeframe and costs to decommission / replace
    - Use, support staff, infrastructure costs and costs/impact upon clients and business partners are all investment factors
    - Risk as a calculable cost (risk management, sharing risk broadly)
    - Scalability
        - Don't redo in order to grow
        - Yet don't be afraid to make a small "throw away" investment tactically when strategic options are not suitable
    - Economies of scale where appropriate
    - Avoiding emotional ties to a particular technology and/or vendor
    - Standards based (terms like open standards, pervasive standards and industry standards are used). ISSUE: What should Wisconsin's stance be?
- Promote sharing, re-use
    - Data, Applications, Skill Sets
    - Avoid redundant efforts
    - Center of Excellence concept?
    - Avoid redundancy except where risk avoidance dictates otherwise
    - Economies of scale where appropriate
- Data is a critical resource and a valuable resource
    - Appropriate privacy and security measures
    - Data is the grist for the application mill: applications would not exist without information
    - Good, solid, well defined security, privacy and security/privacy policy is a precursor to being comfortable sharing data and information. Inadequate security/privacy/policy is an inhibitor to sharing data.
- Governance (Organizational Architecture)
    - Good governance is based on empathy of the parties involved
    - Governance depends on real give and take, which may sometimes require "recompense" to use to make agencies "whole" when they are negatively affected by the consequences of the greater good
    - Governance can be undermined by too much authoritarian / unilateral decision making, and can also be undermined by an environment of secrecy
    - Nobody likes to get the short end of the stick all the time.
- One size does not necessarily fit all (more is not necessarily better, said the hippos as they fell from the sky onto the boat)
    - Can provide a useful starting point though
    - Comes up at a single level of government (based on agency size / capability, business lines, etc.), as well as between levels of government
    - Not all areas of the architecture should necessarily apply to all levels of government (e.g. State probably should not dictate desktop platform to local units of government)
    - Exceptions do not always weaken a standard -- they may allow a consensus to be reached where otherwise none could be reached.
- Avoid making mistakes so as to keep bad news out of the newspapers. 8^)

Arizona GITA Enterprise Architecture observations

- The architecture is well presented and well organized -- apart from the actual content
- The view of data seems insufficient in the face of the apparent mandate to share data and become more efficient
- The business view of data in the AZ documents is indirect -- via the applications -- which may not be appropriate.
- The AZ view of data modeling is dated.
- The target technologies are at too low a level for this group -- more at a level that each individual domain would tackle.
- The target technologies are slightly reminiscent of EO 242. They are quite simplistic.
- The target technologies are quite inclusive / broad, making them inadequate for providing much real guidance in making day to day choices, except in cases where the choice is already obvious.
- The use of the OSI model is somewhat quaint, and caused these technology standards to be hard to interpret / find in the document.
- The document on technology trends feels to me to be almost the antithesis of using business drivers.
- It might be a better model at a single level of government (e.g. the State agencies) than the multi-level "enterprise" that I think we are talking about.

Issues Facing WEAT

-----Original Message-----
From: Jaeger, Jay
Sent: Monday, February 02, 2004 3:18 PM
To: State WEAT Support Team
Subject: Some issues I see facing us...

Some issues that occur to me with respect to our efforts that we will need to tackle eventually:

- What should our stance be with respect to the "open source" debate? Is it important to us, are we neutral, or would we prefer a comfy relationshiop with a vendor.
- How important is disaster recovery / business continuity as compared to its costs? Do we want this at almost any cost? [This one is tough for domains to handle because it crosses several domains]
- I believe that our "business requirements" are not all that well defined:
  - We have some principles from the level of the Governor, but are those intended to be "first order" deciding factors, or "second order" factors to be considered when the choice isn't clear based on other principles?
  - It isn't clear to me which requirements will apply across all levels of government as opposed to which will apply to stage agencies. This will frame the "one size does/doesn't fit all" discussion
  - I have concern that the actual agency business requirements are not reflected thru the BLC, only information about which requirements may not be being currently met -- which is not the same thing at all.
- Changes may require some kind of "recompense" to use to make agencies "whole" when they are negatively affected by the consequences of the greater good
- I have seen signs that the CIO wishes the enterprise architecture to provide specific guidance to state agencies (e.g., I have seen references to the server consolidation needing the results of our work). That seems to conflice with what I thought woud be a higher level of abstraction of the interactions between state agencies and local units of government.

Jay Jaeger
Wisconsin DOT

Statement of Direction for Strategic IT Planning

DRAFT

From: Matt Miszewski and David Schmiedicke
To: Department Secretaries

CC: BLC
TLC

Enterprise and agency strategic business and information technology (IT) planning has contributed greatly to the success of Wisconsin government. State law requires the Department of Administration (DOA) to collect from each executive branch agency a strategic plan for the utilization of information technology to carry out their functions**. The deadline for submission of IT plans this year is March 31, 2004**. The Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) will complete an enterprise IT plan by September 15.

This year, every agency is expected to reduce costs and utilize technology to streamline operations and improve the effectiveness of providing government services. Wherever possible, agencies should utilize, develop and share administrative (back-office) systems rather than develop systems of their own. Where a business case for the development and support of new systems exists, a thorough return on investment (ROI) analysis with accompanying financing plan is required. Agencies should try to fund systems within their base budget first, then clearly identify alternative funding methods (e.g., federally funded initiatives, master lease) with hard, not soft dollars. Position requirements and reductions must also be clearly identified.

Enterprise IT planning, agency IT planning and budgeting are interdependent. An effective and comprehensive enterprise plan requires knowledge of agency activities and requirements. Conversely, agencies' strategic IT plans must take enterprise plans, directions and funding mechanisms into account. Following is a list of enterprise priorities that agencies should consider when developing their plans:

- EASI initiatives for IT systems consolidation efforts (both server consolidation as well as shared administrative systems), real estate consolidation efforts, procurement systems and human resource systems.
- Converged video and data networking.
- Directory Services replacement.
- Re-negotiation of telecommunications contracts.
- Development of an Enterprise Technology Architecture.
- Elimination of redundant or unused centrex lines and cell phones.
- Disaster recovery planning and mirrored computing centers.
- Restructuring of the computer desktop buying process.
- Developing a statewide intranet.
- Data sharing initiatives (including the Enterprise Services Bus).
- Publishing and distribution initiatives such as mail presort outsourcing, inserting consolidation, and mainframe printing.

For the statewide strategic plan to truly reflect the enterprise, it must derive from an up-to-date picture of our current environment with the enterprise data to support it. To this end, DET is

initiating an **enterprise IT inventory**. This inventory will enable decision-makers to base their plans on real data. Information on this ongoing inventory process will be forthcoming. Every effort will be made to collect this baseline data once and the effort will compliment parallel processes currently being deployed such as those involved in server consolidation.

Agency Charge:
Develop a strategic IT plan that identifies

- The agency's **business goals**;
- the agency's **current status** in the alignment of its use of IT to with the agency's own business goals and the governor's goals;
- a **vision** for how the agency will continue to align its use of technology for the next 5 years with the Governor's goals and the agency's own goals;
- a brief discussion of the **timeframe** and manner in which the agency intends to implement its IT initiatives.

Success Criteria

- As a part of the assessment of the agency's current state, the planning team must identify or create inventories of **current asset information** that can be used to develop the enterprise IT inventory discussed above.
- For a strategic plan, either business or IT, to be effective, it must be brief, comprehensive and flexible. For a strategic IT plan to be useful, **all IT initiatives** that arise in an organization must be weighed against the plan. If a new initiative still appears to be needed after being considered against the plan, the plan should be modified to include that initiative. On the other hand, if an initiative does not meet the agency's strategic goals and objectives as laid out in the plan, the agency should not move ahead with it.

We have accomplished much in the past year. We are looking forward to an even more productive few years as we continue to implement our strategic plans, both agency and enterprise.

If you have any questions about the enterprise directions and priorities or strategic planning in general, please do not hesitate to contact Beth Hastings at 267-0624. Questions about enterprise technology priority initiatives should be directed to your Technology Leadership Council (TLC) or your Business Leadership Council (BLC) member. Other questions can be directed to your DOA budget analyst/team leader.

# # #